

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

MS AMLIN MARINE NV, SYNDICATE
0457, SYNDICATE 1969, SYNDICATE
2791, SYNDICATE 5000, CONVEX
INSURANCE UK LTD, and
UNDERWRITERS AT LLOYD'S
LONDON SUBSCRIBING TO POLICY
B1098M203407,

Plaintiffs,

v.

DELTA MARINE INDUSTRIES INC.,
DELTA MARINE INDUSTRIES INC,
MARINE TRAVELIFT INC,
KENDRICK EQUIPMENT (USA) LLC,
KENDRICK EQUIPMENT LTD, and
ARXCIS INC,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:23-cv-14

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION

Defendant Delta Marine Industries, Inc. requests reconsideration of the Court's Omnibus Order, Dkt. No. 177. "Motions for reconsideration are disfavored," LCR 7(h)(1), and "will be denied absent a showing of either manifest error in the Court's prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority" that could not have been brought to the Court's attention earlier with reasonable diligence, *Hempel v.*

1 *United States*, 2002 WL 1987644, at *3 (W.D. Wash. June 25, 2002) (citing LCR
2 7(h)(1)). Whether to grant reconsideration is left to the Court's discretion. *Navajo*
3 *Nation v. Confederated Tribes & Bands of the Yakama Indian Nation*, 331 F.3d
4 1041, 1046 (9th Cir. 2003). Because Delta has met neither requirement, the Court
5 DENIES its motion. Dkt. No. 178.

6 That said, two points are worth clarifying. First, contrary to Delta's
7 suggestion, the Court's prior Order did not establish OSHA regulations as superior
8 to WISHA regulations in defining the relevant standard of care at trial. Rather,
9 such regulations may be admitted as "some evidence" of the applicable standard.
10 Dkt. No. 177 at 21–22. Second, the Court considered Plaintiffs' request for
11 spoliation sanctions as a discovery matter under Rule 37. *Id.* at 25–34. The Court's
12 Order made no determination about the "spoliation of evidence" as a standalone
13 cause of action.

14 Dated this 4th day of February, 2025.

15 

16 Jamal N. Whitehead
17 United States District Judge
18
19
20
21
22
23